Les. Whitten 1401 16 St., NW Wash. D.C. 20036

Dear Les,

If the past 10 days had not been not my best I'd have thought of this earlier, when you'd have had time for a good column. There may still be one but not in time for my need. I'm in court again 6/30, Thursday, in an FOIA case that the FBI has been stringing out since 1969.

I've been maintaining the lowest possible profile in them, fighting them at the cost of other work and the writing I long to get to.

Now I think the law will be strengthened and some of the stuff that for you and me is criminal might be discouraged by a collection of reporters' bodies. There will be some farout stuff that should ne newsworthy. There still ought to be enough for a column even if there is news attention.

Perjury has become the official way of life in these cases. I don't mean only false swearing. I mean deliberate false swearing to the material. I dumped a load of these charges on all those in DJ and FBI who had executed such affidavits when I was under oath last September. It shocked only the judge, who tolerates false official swearing, as all judges do. Atop that and to his face I told the judge the AUSA was lying to her and knew better - that I had seen to it that he knew better. His stalwart denial consisted entirely of "What can I say," together with abandoning cross examination of me in which be succeeded into bettering the record we'll have on appeal, if that is necessary.

We get ahead in these cases because Jim is a very sweet boysish-looking man who does

remarkably fine paper work and I know the subjects as nobody else does.

What I am getting from FBI would blow even your mind. I want no attention to it and have avoided attention to now to get it all, to the degree possible, and not to entice misuse by the whores and self-seekers of whom Lane is merely the symbol.

And then I want to write it.

Jim filed an FOIA case to supplement mine on King. He has been written by the Mr. Clean, so called and supposed-to-be of DJ, that there are certain records that have to be withheld. Ubder investigatory-file and secret-source-to-be-protected this includes the testimony of three Ray brothers in open court in which jim did the examination based on my earlier investigations. This is the transcript of a public session covered by all nets and wires and major papers in 10/74. Now it is an investigatory file and suppressed. (Of course im and I also have the transcripts, as you can if you ask the clerk of the court.)

file from which I'm getting about a thousand pages a week from the FBI the DJ withholds on the same basis. I have about 20,000 pages but Shaheen, office of Responsibility, withholds them from Jim as immune Nine months after Jim and I have forced the FBI to promise in court to deliver not less than two volumes of them a week, as they have.

The strongest part of all is that compared to the so-called "liberals" and "civil libertarians in the DJ when wily old Hoover started his gamesmanship, if to now in total secrecy, they make him look liberal. Comapred with such as Ruckelshouse, Leonard and Pollak.

We have the records of the (has to be) Howver decision to ignore my first king request. As I recall it the government told the court there was no such in 1969. There were two. Now when DeLoach says it was approved unless it was EX Tolson who other than Hoover could have said the hell with the law-and why?

Simultaneously they were pushing Hoover from below to okey a deal with a sycophant. Choice was between erold Frank and Jim Bishop. Both did sycophantic books. The liked Bishope even though they found him pompous because he seemed to be beginning with a Readers

Digest deal and they were heavy in love of the Digest.

They have been getting ready to give me the stuff on me. They've told Jim it is four volumes. That can t be all. I'll know better after I see it. I suspect I'll be able to remember enough. I go way back with them. They tried to frame me in 1940. I had no column, no press behind me when I turned it and them around. I do not expect fidelity in file delivery on that. I do expect a little poison her and a little there to the Bishop-types in the dailies and electronic media. I'm hurting them and they can see more hurt.

I suppose I've come to where I have to face a conflict of interest. While I want most of all for no diversions, to write what I've gotten, the law means very much to me and I can see how these suppressors are gutting it to the silence of those for whom the law was nessed.

The Edwards subcommittee is beginning hearings Honday. They will not have the balls to do a real job. I've not heard a word from them, either. I doubt any individual has filed as many suits. One of mine was cited as a major cause of the 1974 amendments. And Edwards and his staff know about me. But this is not my only reason for believing they will be timid, perhaps doing enough to justify an occasional story.

The reason you found me in a private room when I was hospitalized 10/75 was so I could talk in private to the Abzug and Schweiker subcommittees. Abzug's staff director came out in the early a.m. and drove me to the hospital so I could help him plan his hearings on the way in, as I did. But even "ella backed off. I think the pressure was from which."

Were I seeking personal interest I'd not file another suit and do nothing more in those I've filed. I now have enough for a couple of books a year for more than 10 years, probably twice that much.

From the press to the politicians all fear the political FOIA cases. Yet it is in the political rather than the consumerism field where the law is most important. (It is important in all areas.) This is a political country and if it is to work the way it should or as I see it if the people are to be able to deter the ever-increasing authoritarianism it has to begin with knowledge.

I den't know how the calendar call will go on Thursday and I don't know how Jim will want it to go. We'll not be able to get together before then except by phone and I'll not be able to give him what I've compiled for him before then, either. But it should be a

There is even an item that began with Drew, when he was used without knowing it to set a friend of his and me up. (He and I were not friends but we knew each other and I helped him a bit.) In the end it also turned up evidence of a military plot to overthrow by this government. The FBI had finally admitted it had the records. It says it gave them to by. I've finally gottem a few records from by. They show return to the FBI. What the FBI returned to me I deposited in a university archie last month. It did not include the papers dealing with this plotting. This is the caset in which the FBI combined with the Dies committee to frame the late Pat ackson and me. My recollections are fairly clear stil.

I'm rambling end I want to get to work. My pizz point is a simple one. If the press wants to stop the gutting of the law, which is well under way, and stop much other dishonesty of a nature that endangers any kind of decent society, it might help if there were a journalistic show of interest hursday. Idars are less prone to lie when they may be reported as liars. The judge, who is a very fine lady, only too much the lady -real timid - might also do something instead of making fine speeches and doing nothing.

If you went to talk to me about any of this I don't know my schedule after the hearing. Unless I have a ride back I'll be taking the 2 o'clock bus. 't is not wise for me to drive that much now. Keeps my less down too long.

I hope Jack cought the segment of Good Morning America I did on the 15th. The real reason I did it when I was off on a working trip is to let people, including the major media, know there is a third and a responsible position in my field. (This was not helped when a Dallas TV station, wanting a headline, could not get me to say there was a conspiracy to spring Ray to bill him so instead it just told UPI I had said it. I've asked UPI to

Anyway, if you or any of your people want to talk to me about some of thesethings let me or Jim know. I'll sind what time I have Thursday.